

Remarks/Arguments

This Amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination of the application. Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 16, and 23 have been amended. New claim 28 has been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-27 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable based on combination of European Patent Publication EP 0 718 761 A1 (“Gosling”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,078,951 (“Pashupathy”).

Independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 23 have been amended herein to further clarify one of the aspects of the invention. Specifically, the independent claims require that “the command list includes a plurality of command objects including the command object,” and that “the plurality of command objects” are “usable by a plurality of applications.” As described at page 17, lines 15-22 of the present specification, one of the specific embodiments of the invention is capable of retrieving a requested object from a plurality of command objects included in the command list, and the plurality of command objects are usable by a plurality of applications.

By contrast, none of the cited references teach or suggest the above-identified aspect of the invention recited in independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 23, i.e., the “command list” including “a plurality of command objects.” As the Examiner pointed out, the Gosling publication describes a server including a multitasking operating system. It is respectfully submitted that Gosling’s multitasking operating system in no way suggests, implicitly or explicitly, that a command list includes a plurality of command objects. In fact, Gosling does not even mention a command list in general. Therefore, the multitasking operating system disclosed in Gosling cannot be interpreted as the “command list” including “a plurality of command objects” as claimed.

The Pashupathy patent fails to cure the deficiencies of Gosling because it also fails to teach or suggest the above-identified aspect of the invention recited in the independent claims. The Pashupathy is directed to a method for installing a viewer. As described at column 4, lines 28-49, the client container 300 of Pashupathy’s system lists the application names of viewers. However, such a listing does not include “a plurality of command objects” as claimed. The Pashupathy container 300 lists various fields, such as the classification, the version number, and the source of the viewer, but not command objects as claimed. Accordingly, Pashupathy does not remedy the deficiencies of Gosling.

Further, none of the cited references teach or suggest that the plurality of command objects are usable by a plurality of applications as claimed. As such, the inventions of independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 23 are patentable in this regard as well.

Regarding independent claim 28, it is respectfully submitted that Gosling and Pashupathy, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the claimed features, i.e., "creating a data content handler ... ; retrieving a byte stream from a data source using the data handler; ... ; forwarding the data object from the data content handler to the command object; performing a function by allowing the command object to act on the data object" as claimed. Therefore, claim 28 is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the inventions defined in independent claims 1, 9, 16, 23, and 28, and their dependent claims are patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance at an early date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 510-843-6200.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Godfrey K. Kwan
Reg. No. 46,850

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Tel: 510-843-6200